

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 7-8, 12, 14-15, 18, have been amended, claims 6, 9, and 19-34 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 35-54 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 35-54 read on elected Group I, set forth in the Office Action dated June 19, 2006.

AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The specification has been amended to improve grammar and to clarify the reference to block 828 in FIG. 8. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS:

FIG. 1 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d), M.P.E.P. § 608.02(g), for failure to be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. The outstanding objection is respectfully traversed. FIG. 1 is particularly described in the Detailed Description section of the application, and thereby supports the specification requirements set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the subject matter of FIG. 1 and the corresponding description are useful, *inter alia*, to set forth the manner and process of making and using the invention and to clarify the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out the invention. See, e.g. M.P.E.P. § 2161. This is particularly set forth by the differences and advantages identified by the Applicant in section [0035]. It is respectfully submitted that Applicant has not admitted FIG. 1 to be prior art in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 2129.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding drawing objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Circello et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,192,449. In view of the amendment set forth above and the remarks set forth below, the outstanding anticipation rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of review, Circello illustrates in FIG. 4 a cache 15 that "comprises a line fill buffer or a fill buffer 20." See Circello at col. 5, ln. 14-17. Circello further illustrates in FIG. 5 a control register 50 that is "used to optimize the amount of data that is fetched and loaded into fill buffer 20 *during each cache miss*." See Circello at col. 9, ln. 20-23. Control register 50 "gives a user of data processing system 10 the flexibility to decide how fill buffer 20 is loaded with data *during a cache miss*." Id. at col. 9, ln. 60-64. Thus, the fill buffer 20 of Circello is loaded in response to a cache miss.

On the other hand, claims 1 and 12 now particularly set forth that the on-chip memory is selectably filled with data from an external memory independent of the cache misses under user control. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding anticipation rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Volpe et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,895,475 in view of Circello, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,449. In view of the amendment set forth above and the remarks set forth herein, the outstanding obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with page six ("6") of the Office Action dated August 9, 2006, Volpe "does not clearly and specifically [teach] that the on-chip memory is filled with data from an external memory under user control." Likewise, and as set forth above, Circello neither teaches nor suggests that on-chip memory is selectably filled with data from an external memory independent of the cache misses under user control. In fact, Circello teaches away from filling the Circello line buffer independently, because the Circello line buffer is filled during each cache miss. Accordingly, neither Volpe nor Circello teaches or suggests the invention as set forth by independent claims 1 and 12. Dependent claims 2-11 and 13 incorporate base claim subject matter and are likewise patentable over the applied art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness rejection as applied to claims 1-8 and 10-13 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Volpe et al., set forth above, and in view of Ramchandran, U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0093479. The outstanding obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ramchandran is relied upon on page twelve ("12") of the Office Action dated August 9, 2006 as teaching an internal memory bus having a width equal to a line in cache memory. In short, Ramchandran neither teaches nor suggests that on-chip memory is selectably filled with data from an external memory independent of the cache misses under user control, as claimed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness rejection as applied to dependent claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Volpe et al. and Circello et al., as set forth above, and Wing So, U.S. Patent No. 5,987,590. The outstanding obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed.

The relevant teachings of Volpe and Circello are addressed above.

Wing So is relied upon on page fifteen ("15") of the Office Action dated August 9, 2006 as teaching an integrated circuit including a first processor and a DSP microprocessor.

In short, Wing So neither teaches nor suggests that on-chip memory is selectably filled with data from an external memory independent of the cache misses under user control, as claimed. Likewise, neither Volpe nor Circello teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness rejection as applied to independent claim 14, and dependent claims 15-18 are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS 35-54:

New dependent claims 35-54 depend from independent claims already of record, and set forth above. New claims 35-40 particularly relate to the DME controller illustrated in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, and set forth in the specification beginning at, e.g. section [0044]. Control and scheduling by the DME controller is set forth at section [0045]. New claims 41-42 relate to the wireless device of, e.g. FIG. 9. New claims 43-45 read on, e.g. the DME controller illustrated in

FIG. 3 and FIG. 4. New claims 47-49 depend from claim 12 and are similar to claims 36-38. New claims 50-51 depend from claim 12 and are similar to claims 41-42. New claims 52-54 read on, e.g. the DME controller illustrated in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, and depend from claim 12, and are similar to claims 43-45.

Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 17-0026 in the name of QUALCOMM, Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 22, 2006

/Todd E. Marlette/

Todd E. Marlette, Reg. No. 35,269

Phone: (858) 651-7985

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 845-4265
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502